

Applicant : Min Zhu  
Appl. No. : 09/751,806  
Examiner : Paul H. Kang  
Docket No. : 1640.4006

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant notes that the Notice of Allowance was mailed on December 6, 2006.

Although this paper is responsive to the Office Action dated July 5, 2006, this paper is not an amendment after allowance but is merely being submitted to incorporate the substance of the December 20, 2006 interview into the reply to the last Office Action of July 5, 2006.

This paper further serves to confirm the substance of the Interview as follows:

Examiner Kang confirmed that the title of the application would be amended to read: "SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR APPLICATION SHARING IN COLLABORATIVE SETTING". Applicant further notes that Applicant made this amendment to the title in its paper dated February 16, 2005.

Remarks and Arguments Responsive to July 5, 2006 Office Action

Claims 19 and 28 have been amended, and new claim 35 has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Support for the amendments and new claim 35 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0053] of the application.

Double Patenting

Claims 19-34 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 19-33 of copending Application No. 09/751,424 and claims 19-32 of copending Application No. 09/751,806.

Applicants submit that the claims 19-34, as amended, are patentably distinguishable from those of the copending Applications, and therefore overcome the provisional double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 19-25, 27-32 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quatrano et al. (U.S. 6,748,420) in view of Ramanathan et al. (U.S.

Applicant : Min Zhu  
Appl. No. : 09/751,806  
Examiner : Paul H. Kang  
Docket No. : 1640.4006

6,011,552). Claims 26 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quatrano-Ramanathan in view of Willehadson et al. (U.S. 6,327,567). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is patentable because none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches, or suggests "wherein, upon receiving a request to join the on-line conference from a client computer, the meeting zone connects the requesting client computer to an available one of the collaboration servers, wherein the available collaboration server queries other collaboration servers to determine which one of the other collaboration servers is hosting the on-line conference, and upon locating the hosting collaboration server, connects to the hosting collaboration server."

Quantrano is directed to a system for providing shared access to an application. In one embodiment, Quantrano discloses using a load director 28 to distribute shared sessions across multiple web servers 30-1, 30-P (see col. 29, line 66 to col. 30, line 21). However, nowhere does Quantrano disclose connecting a client computer requesting to join an on-line conference to an available one of the web servers 30-1, 30-P, and having the available web server query other web servers to determine which of the web servers is hosting the on-line conference, and upon locating the hosting web server, connect to the hosting web server.

The claimed invention advantageously enables the system to add a new participant to an on-line conference through an available collaboration server, whether or not the available collaboration server is currently connected to the on-line conference. A further advantage is that the available collaboration server is able to automatically locate and connect itself to the on-line conference by querying other collaboration servers to determine which one of the collaboration servers is hosting the on-line conference and upon locating the hosting collaboration server, connect to the hosting collaboration server. This is neither taught nor suggested by any of the cited references.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 19, and its dependent claims 20-27, are patentable, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Applicant : Min Zhu  
Appl. No. : 09/751,806  
Examiner : Paul H. Kang  
Docket No. : 1640.4006

Claim 28 has been amended to include limitations similar to those of claim 19. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 28, and its dependent claims 29-34, are also patentable, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claim 35 depends from claim 19, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 35.

Conclusion

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the undersigned can be reached at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: January 29, 2007

By:   
Kenneth S. Roberts  
Reg. No. 38,283

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP  
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600  
Irvine, CA 92614-2558  
Tel. 949-567-6700  
Fax: 949-567-6710